

When Pavel Pashin declared that he was not a Russian, but a man of iron, and on good authority gave you one of his recent sayings. When Count Nesselrode's circular was read to him, in which stress is laid on the defensive attitude of Russia, he stroked his beard and said: "Very defensive, very defensive. I should like to see with Count Nesselrode if I could only prove that I am not a Russian side of the Pruth."

Edith Day, the Danish Ethnologist, now cultured, and on his side presented to Svani Pashin the Firman of Gharaz, and in return with respect, the cavassee withdrew the bottle of

Mr. Soule; and he proposed to write a friendly letter to Mr. Soule to remove from his mind the error under which he labored. The friends of Mr. Soule took their leave peacefully satisfied. The following morning the Duke of Alba sat at his writing table the letter of the day before, and which he had not opened. He read it and found that it was couched in terms so violent, so insulting, that he considered himself bound to send, in turn, two of his friends to Mr. Soule, Jr., to demand the withdrawal of what he had just read, and to demand also that the letter of explanation which he himself had written should be returned to him. Mr. Soule withdrew the insulting expressions he

A correspondent of *The London Times*, says:—  
 "The proceedings of the American Commissioner and the American Vice Consul as regards neutrality, are considered somewhat equivocal, and the insurgent chief has addressed a letter on the subject."  
 "The payment of the duties during the capture of Shanghai, and the present collection of them, are being agitated by the foreign authorities and the Imperial Government, and was causing much excitement. The British Consul

poetry will stand at once, on hearing a few lines of a new poem read, 'That is Tennyson's—or Browning's—or Bryant's—or Whittier's—or Holmes's, as the case may be—and he will have judged aright ninety nine times in a hundred. If so, is it not clear that even popular allorship is something quite other and higher than Mr. Carey's necessities compel him to pronounce it?'  
By no means, as he would be answered. If it had been so, you could have found no occasion for talking of my "unpoetical" before you had proved their error. It is quite true that the several gentlemen here named had popularised a mode of clothing the ideas they place before the world.

then, and the race over which the polemic is exhibited, there shall have a monopoly of the products of exhibiting. It is a mistake to maintain that the larger and the wider this monopoly, the slower will be the progress of invention and that high state of intellectual condition required for enabling him properly to appreciate the labors of such men as Arago, Newton, and Lamarck, and the more distant will be the time when those labors will be paid. The shorter the time of the exclusive privilege, provided it be sufficient to induce the application of labor and talent to the study of books—the sooner will such men be appreciated and rewarded. Literature is, as I have said in the pamphlet now before me, a most honorable profession, and the greater the

THE LATE

To the first portion of this paragraph I demur, as being contrary to natural justice, and as calculated to produce upon the mind of the jury a prejudice against the accused, which would be more likely to prevent them from reaching a just conclusion, than to assist them in doing so. I think, however, that the jury would be more likely to be influenced by the fact that the accused was a man of good character, and that he was a man of good character, than by the fact that he was a man of good character.

"your property," in his book. Have I sought to lessen his present rights? Is there a line that I have written that docks as if I desired to diminish the control he now has over the fruits of his labor? If so, I beg you to produce it. Have I not said, distinctly, that the literary man is entitled to the protection of the law," and have I not urged that that which is now granted to most of them should be extended to the class of dramatic writers, now unprotected against representation without their consent? Is it not one of the objects of what I have written to induce our authors to be satisfied with what they have, and not to risk being part of that in the effort to obtain more? If you

You find a single passage in the pamphlet that warrants you in placing me before the world as being opposed to the true interests of authors, let it be produced. Between us then and the consumers of books, there is, as I conceive, no perfect harmony of interest; and I am anxious to see the cord that now unites them producing discord by drawing so tightly upon each end, that the two may break.

As regards your answer to the question—What shall be the measure of the right of property?—I have to say that here it appears to me to be entirely opposed to the daily teaching of your paper, and that I can entertain other views.

the subject, you may, perhaps, have yourself to thank for it. Within a month, I have, as it appears to me, read repeated calls upon your city authorities to look to the proper use of "the public domain," by individuals. On one day you have told of danger to life from the driving of cattle through the streets, and on another, of the huge piles of bricks by which other streets have been encumbered. As yet, I do not recollect to have seen a complaint against any one for having made "a cart, a table, or a floor-barrel" of the "wood growing" on that part of "the public domain" that is used by your citizens as a park, but if any one should venture upon such a course of action

your City papers to invoke the action of the law in defense of the public rights. Again, you have spoken in approval of the proceedings of the General Government, in prosecuting men who have taken timber from the public lands for the purpose of making "carts, tables and flour-barrels," but if such carts and tables are "clearly theirs, to be used, preserved and sold, as to them shall seem good," is it not their right of appropriation to interfere with those timber thieves who steal from the public lands? It must be the case. Further, the public lands are national property, and the Government has the right to protect them.

even millions of acres, by any process having the force and authority of the law. According to the law, the Government has the right to take any portion of the "public domain" as it best pleases, and to give it to whomever it chooses. It is not for the people to say "No" or "Yes" or "Not." In all this you are in, and which you support. The people have rights in your streets, in your parks, in your fairs, in the public lands, and in the timberlands, and growing on them—and the vast treasure of materials for the books that has been accumulated by the labor of successive generations.

generations during many thousands of years, and to those who belong to determine the conditions upon which they may be used by the gentlemen who desire to place them in a popular form before the world. When they propose to permit men to cultivate the public lands, they fix a price upon them, and they have the same right to fix a price upon that portion of the public domain that constitutes the material of books. If the price of land be too high, it will not sell, and if the compensation to authors be too low, they will not work. The literary man should be made to feel

that he has a fair chance to obtain a proper compensation for his labor and talent, but the legislator who grants him more does injustice to the people he represents.

Now if it were wholly true that popular authors derive their noblest ideas mainly from the great thinkers whose works have been narrow and unprofitable sale, that fact would by no means justify the law. It would only show that the law is a violation of the Law should then say to Dickens, Marryat, Thackeray, &c., "You have no right, and we will concede you next to none, and if you insist on your ideas are mainly borrowed from Platon, Democritus, Aristotle, and other great thinkers, you are not entitled to a copyright, who have pulled legs in poetry, and have secured no profits."

Here, again, as it would seem, I have been misled by *The Tribune*. Having read that paper carefully for some

And I have been led to think that the less that was paid to the middleman, the more there would be for producer and consumer—the first obtaining more cloth for his best and the second more wheat for his cloth, but in this it would now appear, I have erred. To improve the condition of the producer of the raw material of books and the consumer of the books themselves, we should pay more to the middleman that works up the materials and places them before the world, and then make a law requiring him to divide his profits with the producers. Improved

It is a grievance that such men as those to whom you have referred should have no rights, and should be equal to the rest of the age that men like Cuvier and Humboldt should live and die poor, while Thackeray, Dickens and Mrs. Stowe accumulate fortunes. Is not this a grievance to be removed? By foregoing the time which they devote to the study of the singularities of their species, shall have a power of transcendence of exhibiting

Certainly not. The larger and the more that society, the state will be the progress of mankind. The high state of intellectual condition required for enabling him properly to appreciate the labors of such men as Arago, Kant, and Lamarck, and the more distant will be the time when those labors will be paid. The shorter the time of the exclusive privilege, provided it be sufficient to induce the application of labor and talent to the making of books the sooner will such men be appreciated and paid. Literature is, as I have said in the pamphlet, even

to the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.

the respective rights of the authors and the people. In doing, I shall prefer in all cases, to give your own words.

air readers might have understood the views I have of

You have presented accurately my idea of the two classes of men concerned in the production of books—the one fur-

common property; and the other dressing up the common property to present it in a lively, pleasing attire, and a

for their own profit. The first are almost universally unpaid, while the second are generally, and often largely, paid; and yet the labor of the last is valued at less than

partially as Mr. C. assumes it to be with regard to *some* books, it is clearly *not* so with respect to others. For in

new poem read, 'That is Tennyson's—or Browning's, or Bryant's, or Whittier's, or Holmes's, as the case may be—and he will have, indeed, eight nineteenth-century

By no means clear, be assured. If it had been so, you

that the several gentlemen here named have peculiar modes of clothing the ideas they place before the world,